

Community Preservation Act Committee (CPAC)
Draft Meeting Minutes
Monday, March 7th, 2016

The meeting was called to order in the Town Room at the Town Hall at 7:05 pm by Ms. Streeter.

Committee Members in Attendance: Mary Streeter, Chair; Paris Boice, Vice-Chair; Jim Brissette, Peter Jessop, Laura Lovett, Jim Oldham, Pari Riahi, Diana Stein **Absent:** Marilyn Blaustein

Staff in Attendance: Sonia Aldrich, Jonathan Tucker, David Ziomek

Others in Attendance: Georgia Barnhill, Jeff Morgan, Sarah LaCour, Megan Rosa, Andy Steinberg, Jane Wald, Jim Wald

Agenda items discussed:

Public Comment.

Discussion & Votes on Proposals.

Updates & Announcements (Financial, news, etc.).

Public comments

Ms. Sarah La Cour of the BID expressed her support for the North Common project, and wanted to speak in favour of the project. She mentioned that the proposal contains both elements of recreation and historic preservation. She called the North Common a focal point in the downtown open area and a primary place for both gathering and activity. She stated that the BID is supportive and willing to do anything they can do to get the project off the ground.

Ms. Georgia Barnhill, President of the Amherst Historical Society, expressed support for the Strong House and highlighted the importance of getting to build the elevator and the bathrooms.

Mr. Jim Wald, Past President of the Amherst Historical Society, talked about the evolving laws concerning preservation projects. He mentioned that lots of projects that are not necessarily doing preservation, are getting work done in the areas of inventory, in documentation, clearing titles and ownerships in order to preserve the building and restoring collections.

Ms. Streeter stated that she is in support of the Strong House, but is not sure if she can fund all the projects or would have to eliminate some other projects.

Ms. Megan Rosa from the LSSE commission and as a parent of the three children mentioned that she is in support the Groff park project. She stated that doing work at Groff Park touches on social justice issues, since it concerns giving access to kids so that they can cool off and allows them to play in the open space during the summer times and all year long.

Ms. Streeter stated that she was open to suggestions on how to go through the list. And she asked other members of the Committee if there were any projects that needed to go first.

It was then suggested to start with the North Common as the first project.

Mr. Ziomek opened by stating that everyone knows the project and there is urgency to get it done. He stated that they have proposed a phased approach spanning over 2 years. They suggest doing the design portion and basic infrastructure work, and then come back to town in a couple of years to do the rest of work. He

clarified that the select board has to approve the design. 3-5 months to design it. The design is about 50,000, then 140,000 will be allocated for basic work such as irrigation, lighting, etc. Then will come back to the second phase. The estimate is 500,000 to 550,000.

Ms. Lovett asked for the percentage of what portion would be preservation and what would be recreation.

Ms. Aldrich explained that the North Common was a combination of 60% preservation, 40% recreation.

Mr. Jessop stated that the committee has already voted in favor of the project, and asked whether the grant was received?

Mr. Ziomek explained that since the project was contingent on getting grant, and did not get it, then has to go to CPAC.

Mr. Jessop asked whether the money had to be re-allocated in the town meeting and that the other money would come from CPAC funds later on?

Mr. Oldham asked how would this money get accounted for? Ms. Aldrich clarified that the amount would be an amendment to the current budget year.

Ms. Streeter stated that \$50,000 for a public process seemed elevated and asked whether there was a way to make the process less costly? Mr. Ziomek clarified that the town would not be paying for the public process but for professionals. Staff would support the process, but would not do design themselves.

Mr. Brissette expressed that he was in favor of the project. There are key areas in town that need the fundamentals and he feels that it is absolutely essential to make it into a decent space.

Mr. Jessop moved to allow town staff to draft and make the previous allocation so that the project can go forward. Ms. Boice seconded. It was agreed by consensus.

Mr. Oldham mentioned that he was in agreement with the project, but his concern was that he would have liked them to rethink the scope of the project. He suggested that if we wanted to be fiscally prudent, since we would do it on our own, how would we do it? Maybe recognize, that there might be certain costs that need to be lowered.

Mr. Ziomek expressed that while he appreciated the comments, he would be happy to explain in detail that the project deals with complex entities such as erosion, drainage, lighting, He talked about about the difference in level, and the need for water shedding as well as lighting to make it safe and accessible. He also talked about the need to redoing the sidewalks and clarified that there is nothing that can be cut out of the current proposals.

Mr. Oldham then stated that in this case all the money would be used. Mr. Jessop stated that he trusted the town staff. He encouraged them to be fiscally prudent, knowing that it is all tax dollars, so that when they would return to the CPAC next time all is revised to make sure everything is done so that it saves money.

Mr. Ziomek assured the committee that if there will be design items that can be done differently or more economically, they will be done accordingly. He also expressed hope as to getting some other forms pf support such as fund raising or donations.

Ms. Boice suggested looking into private donations for benches, etc.

Ms. Riahi expressed support for the project.

Ms. Stein asked whether the P.A.R.C. Grant was the only type that can be done for the second part? She mentioned that she had a comment about the removable furniture and was not certain if they were a good idea since vandalism might happen and damages to the furniture might occur?

Mr. Ziomek clarified that there are very few resources to be tapped into for finding money to preserve historic structures, etc. He mentioned that Northampton is redoing the Pulaski Park for a \$2.5 million budget, and that most of the money is coming from the CPAC. He reassured all the members that they have tried and gave it their best. He suggested to be looking at the glass half full by expressing that if approved by the town meeting, then they can solicit the private donors.

Ms. Lovett asked about the vision and recommended that the Common would preserve its small town charm and character.

Mr. Ziomek reassured her by explaining that the design will go through the Planning Board, the Design Board and the Select Board. There would be a lot of guidance and overseeing the project. The town staff are sensitive to the location and the context.

Mr. Jonathan Tucker, the town planner, from the public clarified that all site lightings will be down cast and that is a standard now.

Ms. Streeter asked when the public process on the North Common would take place?

Mr. Ziomek responded that it would happen in the fall.

Ms. Streeter expressed her concern over the issue of maintenance. She asked if there would be a budget on DPW's so that the money that the CPAC has put into it, won't disappear over the time.

Mr. Ziomek agreed that there needed to be a lot of thought put into how to maintain things. For the 2017, there is money. The town is proposing an additional \$63,000 to eliminate the deficit in the DPW so that they can focus on maintenance. He stated that they are hopeful and acknowledged the need to allocate the appropriate amount of money to maintain structure.

Mr. Ziomek: a broader discussion between the CPAC funding and the capital funding.

Ms. Streeter asked the members if there was any further discussion on that topic. There was none.

Mr. Jessop then moved to authorize town staff to make an article to go forward the previously allocated amount to move forward on the North Common Project. Ms. Boice seconded. The Vote for the North Common Project was all in favor (8 to 0).

Ms. Streeter suggested that the committee considered the Groff Park Proposal.

Mr. Ziomek stated that Groff Park is a million dollar project in two parts: First they intend to bring the park up to ADA standard and make the spray park, the second part will focus on building the pavilion and the playground. He emphasized that the playground is old and outdated, and not up to current ADA standards. The wading pool dates from the 1940/50s and therefore in a bad shape. Mr. Ziomek stated that the town has worked with LSSE to create an improvement in form of a spray park with its associated pavilion, and a

playground. All these components will be accessible, within sight, on the upper level, and not on the flood plane. Would work with designers from Berkshire Designs, which has worked on a dozen of similar structures. Mr. Ziomek also stated that spray parks are safe, cost saving structures.

Ms. Stein referred to an email, which suggested that might be this cost could be covered over three years.

Mr. Ziomek stated that they would not be able to start the project, until they have the full amount commitment.

Ms. Boice asked if they could first work on the spray park now and then do the rest?

Mr. Ziomek clarified that the P.A.R.C. Grant is \$400,000. The spray park and the pavilion would be \$600,000, then the second phases would do the playground.

Mr. Jessop asked if the amount can it be lowered to \$500,000 or \$550,000?

Mr. Oldham reminded everyone that the total budget is \$1,000,000. The initial request from CPAC is \$600,000 assuming that the P.A.R.C. Grant will be obtained for the other \$400,000.

Ms. Riahi asked if the order could be reversed since the spray park seems the most expensive item?

Mr. Ziomek explained that there is more of a chance to get approved with a water feature, when applying for the P.A.R.C. Grant and furthermore, the infrastructure needs to be done first so there is no possibility of reversing the order.

Ms. Lovett expressed that she was confused. Since \$600,000 is a lot of money, what happened if the committee voted in favor of this project and everything else got less?

Ms. Streeter suggested that there could be a motion for \$500,000 or \$600,000 depending on how the committee members feel.

Mr. Brissette stated that \$550,000 would be a compromise. He added that whether we like to spend any money or not on a spray park, safety feature, etc. safety issues, etc. Playgrounds need to be done by professionals who are certified. It costs a significant amount of money. He furthermore reminded other members that the wading pool is not meeting safety standards. He also emphasized the social justice since this may be the only access for the apartments as their cooling element.

Ms. Streeter stated it is important that the park remains free in access.

Ms. Stein stated that this it is a lot and if we can see where we stand on the budget, before we vote.

Ms. Streeter asked Mr. Ziomek that if the amount would be lowered, how does that affect what the town would obtain from the state?

Mr. Ziomek stated that the contribution is a 70%-30%. \$500,000 would be challenging. If the committee would vote for \$550,000 they would be able to make a do.

Mr. Oldham: 70%/ 30% how are we providing \$600,000 or \$500,000? So if we did less than 600 that would not change the match. He reminded the committee members that the costs should be balanced. If you are saying that this is the most important thing that we should do for recreation, then maybe we should borrow

money from the future year's budget. He further stated that he is happy about the spray park and the need for a pavilion that has electricity.

Mr. Ziomek clarified that the lower pavilion does not have electricity and further reminded everyone that the structure of the pavilion are not high-end structure. It is the basic standards for birthday parties, graduation, etc. People need electricity for all sorts of reasons.

Mr. Brissette stated that for the CPAC recreation is always on the bottom of the list. However if we wanted to fund affordable housing, then we still need to provide recreation down the road. Turners Falls is a poor town but they have beautiful fields and safe and nice, environments for the kids.

Mr. Jessop made a motion to recommend a budget of \$550,000 for the modernization of Groff Park to the town meeting.

Mr. Brissette seconded the motion.

Mr. Jessop suggested that the rest of the budget would be figured out later.

Ms. Stein stated that the amount of money was large.

Ms. Aldrich stated that they could borrow funds if they do not get the Park Grant, but she was not certain

Ms. Lovett expressed concern that perhaps the second pavilion might be too much.

Mr. Ziomek stated that the current pavilion is 50 years old. He explained that they would only be updating the roof on the lower pavilion but there is need for an ADA pavilion on the higher ground.

Ms. Streeter asked about when would the public process begin? She stated that she had no problem with a second pavilion and cautioned not to overbuild at Groff Park. As former teacher she felt assured that the kids will go to that park.

Mr. Ziomek mentioned that the town staff were sensitive to over-building. He stated that since the P.A.R.C. Grants are due in late July, if the CPAC recommended the project to the town meeting and that the result would be positive, they would be able to submit it in July, and then would hear about the grant by October.

Ms. Streeter asked about the details of the public process.

Mr. Ziomek explained that they would work with LSSE, they would be having meetings at Groff Park and in Town Hall so that it will inform their process.

Mr. Brissette explained that the LSSE has heard about the park from the public. That the people who are disabled cannot get down there and spend time in the shade, which is why there will be a new pavilion: a shade structure to shelter the people. He then asked the Committee members if it would be typical to say the money awarded would be contingent on the P.A.R.C. Grant?

Mr. Jessop explained that it would not be contingent but a stand-alone project. Ms. Stein asked Mr. Ziomek what would happen if they did not obtain the P.A.R.C. Grant?

Mr. Ziomek responded that the \$550,000 would cover the ADA updates, the spray park and the improvements to the lower pavilion (phase one).

Ms. Lovett asked if it was part of the project to create walkways that would take people to the lower pavilion?

Mr. Ziomek responded that it would not.

Ms. Streeter asked whether Mr. Jessop would consider allocating \$500,000? Mr. Jessop answered that he would not.

Mr. Oldham asked to have a discussion to talk about when to do it.

Mr. Jessop then withdrew the motion he made earlier.

Ms. Streeter asked the members of the committee if there would be any projects that would be considered ineligible? Ms. Stein reminded the Committee about the legal question about the legal ability to fund two projects.

Ms. Streeter then suggested going around and hearing every member of the committee's thoughts.

Ms. Boice expressed concern with the \$18,000 sum for legal part on the Strong House proposal.

Mr. Brissette claimed that he had heard enough so that the Committee could approve all that is there.

Ms. Lovett stated that if the library improvement would take place, then the legal work for the Strong House needed to be undertaken. She also expressed support for the Lincoln-Sunset Study to go through.

Ms. Stein expressed her discomfort at supporting breaking a will and clarified that the rest were fine according to her.

Ms. Lovett added that there are precedents to break a will.

Ms. Stein claimed that breaking the will would change what the house was destined for.

Mr. Jessop expressed that he was comfortable with everything.

Ms. Streeter stated that she was not comfortable for the legal reasons. May we vote on those three items. Still struggling with the advice that she got on Thompson Memorial. She suggested that the Committee might vote for that proposal if it feels that the project rehabilitates the cemetery.

Mr. Oldham stated that none of the projects has a problem legally and disagreed with Mr. Brissette. He clarified that it was a different thing when the board solicited an opinion, then the board still might make our own judgment. We want to be more careful for legal opinions. He stated that he was completely convinced for the historical society to clear the will. It is the fact that the CPAC money has to be allocated.

Ms. Riahi stated that she was in agreement and she preferred an item-by-item vote for the Historical Society.

Ms. Streeter asked the board if there were any projects they would like to see approved for the full amount they requested.

Ms. Boice stated that the open space ones would be the ones she would support.

Mr. Oldham stated that the board has already agreed to the \$3,500 for CPAC's administrative appropriation. The Hoerle was approved for the \$68,500.

Ms. Boice made a motion to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$84,668 for the Protection of Cushman Brook -Acquisition of Stosz & Stowes properties on either side of East Leverette Rd. Mr. Jessop seconded. Voted: 8 to 0

Ms. Boice also made a motion to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$15,000 for Open Space surveys, appraisals and related studies Ms. Stein: seconded. Voted 8 to 0.

Mr. Jessop made a motion to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$5000 for Amherst Historical Commission's Christopher Thompson Memorial. Ms. Stein seconded.

Andy Steinberg pointed out that the Legal opinion from Kopleman and Paige suggests how to make the recommendation. The committee makes two findings: if the CPAC decided the stone rehabilitates the cemetery. If the CPAC found that the installation of the memorial stone will make the cemetery function for the intended use.

Mr. Jessop stated that he had taken those two points into my motion, and expressed the modified motion as such: that CPAC recommend to town meeting the \$5000 and that it includes the back up documentation in terms of the rehabilitation of the cemetery and makes it for intended use. The committee has taken into consideration all of the concerns raised by the attorney.

Mr. Oldham expressed that he could not understand how this memorial, valuable in its own right, would make the cemetery functional for its intended use.

Ms. Stein expressed that having been in that cemetery she had not had an opportunity to realize that there were African Americans from Amherst that took part in the Civil War. She expressed that it would be important to become aware, and the fact that the stone would be new, would raise awareness.

Ms. Lovett elaborated that historically cemeteries were also intended as an active historical context in which visitors learned about the past.

Mr. Steinberg stated that it serves historical purposes too. So it is important in terms of the historical significance.

Ms. Riahi expressed support for Ms. Lovett's point.

Mr. Jessop then modified his motion to add that the the committee has determined that the proposal rehabilitates the cemetery and makes it functional for its intended use. Ms. Stein seconded. Voted: 7-0-1 (Ms. Streeter abstained because of the advice she got.)

Ms. Lovett then suggested that the Committee proceed in the order of the historical commission, and look at their other priorities.

Ms. Boice made a motion to recommend to the Town meeting the mount of \$10,000 for the Historic Preservation Appraisals, Surveys, and Related Studies. Mr. Brisette seconded. Voted 7-0-1 (Ms. Streeter abstained)

Ms. Aldrich expressed that it was not likely.

Ms. Lovett made a motion recommending to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$42,500 for Amherst Historical Society.

Ms. Streeter asked if making it itemized could be done?

Mr. Brissette seconded the motion.

Mr. Oldham: stated that this was a far less collaborative approach.

Ms. Lovett stated that she would withdraw her motion and make a motion that the proposal is then divide it up to three items. She then made a motion to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$24,500 for Amherst Historical Society's carpentry and the dendrochronology. Ms. Stein seconded.

Ms. Stein stated that in her view those two parts were fine. Mr. Oldham stated that he would echo that. In this case, he would be supportive. Ms. Riahi agreed also. Mr. Brissette expressed that he was also fine with a well presented case we can support this. **Voted 8 to 0.**

Ms. Lovett then made a motion to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$18,000 for the legal portion. Mr. Brissette seconded.

Ms. Stein expressed that the \$18,000 is what the legal counsel had advised against. She clarified that she would vote against it. Ms. Streeter also confirmed that she would be against it. Mr. Oldham mentioned that he would be against it.

Ms. Lovett stated the support would allow access to the second floor, therefore it needs to be done.

Mr. Jim Wald of the Historical Society stated that the work is to be done. The feasibility was done before for 2012 to determine the architectural feasibility, financial and legal fees, etc.

Mr. Brissette stated that he would be supportive since it is his belief that our historical preservation needed to become forward thinking. If this is not going to be accessible, usable, then it is not of much use. He emphasized that that portion was a critical piece.

Jim Wald stated that the lawyer is wrong. The Mass Historical Society is under no obligation to preserve the building.

Voted 3-3-2 Motion failed. (Mr. Brissette, Ms. Lovett and Mr. Jessop voted for), Mr. Oldham, Ms. Streeter and Ms. Stein voted against it), (Ms. Boice and Ms. Riahi abstained)

Mr. Jessop made a motion to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$90,000 for Habitat. He stated that they had asked for \$100,000 and that he felt that they deserve the support based on their track record. Ms. Stein seconded.

Mr. Oldham stated that he would like to support this project to the full amount. Mr. Jessop stated that he could also support \$100,0000. Ms. Boice stated that she would support Mr. Oldham.

Mr. Jessop then made a suggestion to change the motion to recommend the \$100,000.

Ms. Lovett then asked the Committee members whether they felt that they had satisfied the historical portion?

Ms. Stein stated that there was no documentation that construction costs have gone up. Mr. Oldham stated that he did not remember if the committee had asked the question and if it was correct to do so.

Vote 4-4. The motion failed.

Ms. Lovett then made a motion to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$90,000 for the Habitat for Humanity's North Pleasant proposal. Mr. Jessop seconded.

Voted 8-0.

Ms. Lovett made a motion to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$200,000 for the Fire Suppression System for the Dickinson Museum. Ms. Stein seconded.

Mr. Brissette explained that initially he was hesitant, but now he would be in support of the proposal. He explained that the project was an important landmark in a major historic district and he felt that supporting the project would establish a high bar. He confirmed that in his view this proposal is at the core of where to preserve an absolutely critical function to the town.

Ms. Streeter stated that a strong case has been made, but if Amherst College could participate more it would be great. She mentioned that recently funds were awarded for a new conservatory and that she would vote for \$150,000. Mr. Jessop stated that he would agree with Ms. Streeter. He would also be supporting \$150,000. He favours the project but would vote no to this motion. Mr. Oldham also expressed that he would like a lower number.

Ms. Lovett stated that this was her motion and she was not willing to change the amount. She talked about the importance of the house as a vivid and complete example of life in the 1880s, therefore essential to her as a teaching tool among other things. She clarified that the kind of fire suppression that is needed would have to be sophisticated.

Jane Wald, the executive director of Emily Dickinson Museum expressed that Amherst College is going to match the funds. The cost of the project won't shrink. So there will be a shortfall. The gift that was received for the conservatory was different. She stated that Amherst College can raise money for exciting things, but community support is needed for projects such as sprinkler. They made an offer to match the CPAC funds.

Voted 2-5-1 (Ms. Lovett and Mr. Brissette voted for; Ms. Stein abstained) Motion failed.

Mr. Jessop: moved to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$150,000 for the Dickinson Museum's Evergreen Fire suppression System. Ms. Streeter seconded.

Voted 6-0-2 (Mr. Brissette and Ms. Lovett abstained.)

Ms. Lovett moved to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$200,000 for the First Congregational Church's fire suppression system. Ms. Stein seconded.

Mr. Jessop suggested that the Church might either have to raise money, or do it partially. Ms. Stein asked whether they are using the money for sprinklers? She felt conflicted, since this was a bigger cut. She expressed the importance of saving the building from being burnt down. Ms. Boice expressed that they have already raised enough money.

Mr. Jeff Morgan from the church reassured the Committee that the money would be used towards the sprinkler system. The priority is the older part of the structure. They have plans for installing sprinklers over the entire building and might need to phase the project.

Ms. Stein mentioned that she had received letters to not support the church. She expressed that she felt compelled to support the project since the church is an integral part of the Dickinson area. It is also like a second community center. It does a lot of work. AA meetings occur there. They are providing a warm place for people. These are valuable to the community.

Mr. Oldham stated that \$200,000 is the recommendation from the Historical Commission and wondered if the committee could not do similarly as it did for the Dickinson Museum.

Ms. Lovett reminded everyone that there was a match for the Dickinson. Mr. Brissette claimed that in his budget he had \$200,000 for each and that he was in favor of the project. Mr. Jessop agreed with Mr. Brissette. Ms. Riahi agreed also. **Vote 6-0-2** (Ms. Boice and Mr. Oldham abstained)

Mr. Oldham moved to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$227,248 to support the Valley CDC Mortgage Subsidy Program. Ms. Boice seconded that.

Mr. Oldham stated that while the original proposal had some weaknesses, they are offering a very low cost way to achieve affordable housing. It is very effective for houses at that price. He encouraged all to support that. Mr. Jessop expressed that he should recuse myself from the voting on the Valley CDC, since he is an active board member.

Mr. Brissette stated that housing projects are \$40,000 or less, and this one is in the upper fifties per unit and a significant amount of this money is for administrative costs. He leans towards no for the per unit costs.

Ms. Boice expressed satisfaction that that they came back and made it affordable. Habitat is also asking for over \$40,000 per unit.

Ms. Streeter stated that she would approve \$200,000. Mr. Oldham suggested that the Committee needed to allocate more than \$40,000 per unit.

Mr. Brissette expressed that there are some strong and unique proposals. He accentuated that the Committee needed to balance and make sure this is a good value.

Ms. Lovett expressed that she would support Mr. Brissette's point. She was worried that the Committee was trying to bring the cost of mortgage down.

Mr. Jessop claimed that funding Groff Park at \$550,000 would make a deficit of \$285,000. Ms. Streeter suggested not to put a cap on the type of project and asked for the vote.

Voted 6-0-2 (Mr. Jessop and Ms. Riahi abstaining)

Mr. Brissette suggested that the best way to solve homeless problem was to make fixed homes with services. He suggested setting \$200,000 aside with the goal of making permanent housing for the homeless. And stated that his money could be put in an affordable housing fund.

Ms. Stein recommended a set amount of \$150,000. She mentioned that there are 19 homeless people in Amherst, and claimed that that would be a very long-term project. She reminded the Committee that there was a letter of support from Amherst Housing Authority that supported the project. She suggested that they focus on three people instead of the initial 5 they had proposed.

Mr. Oldham mentioned that in his view that should be enough funding for three. He emphasized that supporting projects of the kind will allow people to bring such projects forward.

Ms. Streeter expressed that she would like to set aside \$200,000 for housing, and she suggested allocating \$125,000 the Amherst Community Connections to get through the first year and get a status report, by either

having less people or a shorter time. Ms. Boice stated that a shorter time would not be as good, since the proposal unfolds at the specified duration.

Ms. Stein suggested that they could take three people for three years.

Ms. Lovett expressed her uncertainty in understanding how we the committee would designate money for reserve funds while there were specific proposals at hand. Ms. Streeter clarified that the Committee can always reserve funds or set aside funds.

Mr. Brissette stated that cities that do similar things have vast resources at their disposal. He claimed that wanting to resolve homelessness remains an untested territory. It is a lot of money that the Amherst Community Connection is asking for. He wanted to express his view that if money is not allocated for permanent homes for the homeless, the situation would never improve.

Mr. Oldham expressed that he would not vote any money, but he would vote for setting money aside. This way the Committee would earmark that money, and wait and see when they would come to us in the fall. We have a group of local organizations that do valuable work in the housing front and they might also come with proposals in the fall.

Mr. Jessop agreed that that would allow the Committee to fund ACC for \$150,000 and then by earmarking it, they can come back for a specific project, relative to other projects. I understand that if they are going through appraisals for \$25,000. Keep the ACC at the \$150,000.

Ms. Streeter reiterated that the local historic study might be funded for the \$5000. \$25,000 should be allocated to the municipal housing trust and \$550,000 to Groff Park.

Ms. Boice reminded the Committee of the \$15,000 for open space appraisals.

Mr. Jessop moved to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$25,000 for the Amherst Municipal Affordable Trust. Mr. Brissette seconded.

Mr. Oldham asked whether the Committee could make a recommendation to put money aside so that could be used in the fall. **Voted: 8-0**

Mr. Jessop made a motion to set aside \$100,000 for housing that would be available after fall town meeting.

Mr. Oldham expressed his concern that affordable housing had less allocated funds than the historical buildings. He mentioned that he was not comfortable with that. Town meeting did vote to make a Municipal Housing Trust. He confirmed his belief to be able to set aside \$125,000. Mr. Jessop suggested to set aside \$125,000 and to allocate \$150,000 to the Amherst Community Connections.

Ms. Aldrich clarified that in this round, more funds have been allocated to affordable housing in than in previous rounds.

Mr. Brissette expressed that in his view \$100,000 should be ok. Mr. Jessop expressed that he would favor \$125,000 for a housing reserve to be set aside and \$150,000 from 5 to three homeless individuals.

Ms. Lovett expressed that there is affordable housing in town, while for historic projects, for the zoning, and planning, we don't do as much as we should. She suggested that other strategies such as zoning changes and landlord initiative programs could be in place. She expressed that she would make a push for the historic district.

Mr. Oldham mentioned that there are certain things that the CPAC can do and should do.

Mr. Jessop suggested setting aside for \$125,000 for housing reserve. He then suggested that Amherst community connection would be allocated 150,000 for three resident for the three years. Revote Sunset and Lincoln for \$5000, The Dickinson Museum from \$150,000 to \$190,000. That includes the Groff Park at \$550,000.

Mr. Brissette expressed concern about not knowing the number and the inner workings of the Community Connection's program.

Ms. Stein stated that since this was a pilot project, the committee could ask for it to be done for 3 people for 3 years. Mr. Oldham expressed that this was ok, but that the Committee cannot tie it into a requirement, since all the conditions cannot be foreseen. Mr. Jessop expressed that the project was critical.

Mr. Oldham then suggested that it should be worded that the program should support at a minimum of three people over a period three years.

Ms. Lovett asked whether the committee could ask them to suggest a use. Ms. Stein suggested that the committee could ask them to revise the budget. Mr. Jessop then mentioned that what they do should at least cover the span of 2 years. Ms. Stein suggested that based on the proposal, the committee should require 3 years and 3 individuals.

Mr. Jessop then moved to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$550,000 for modernization of Groff Park. Ms. Boice seconded. Voted 7-0-1 (Mr. Oldham abstained)

Mr. Jessop moved to set aside \$125,000 as a reserve fund for housing. Ms. Boice seconded. Voted 8-0.

Mr. Jessop moved to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of a total of \$150,000 to fund the Amherst Community Connection Program for 3 years. Included in that motion would be the expectation of the committee that a minimum of three individuals would be taken care of over the period of three years. Ms. Boice seconded. Voted 8-0

Ms. Lovett made a motion to amend the amount of recommended appropriation for the Dickinson Museum Fire Suppression to \$190,000. Mr. Jessop seconded. Voted 8-0

Ms. Lovett moved to recommend to Town Meeting the appropriation of \$5,000 to fund the Lincoln-Sunset Historical District Inventory by reminding every one that this is the oldest integrated neighborhood in town. Mr. Brissette seconded.

Ms. Stein expressed worry about the letter about DOR. Mr. Oldham stated that he was comfortable with being able to fund this. Woman from public stated that inventory is the first step for preservation.
Voted 8-0

Mr. Jessop moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:44. Ms. Streeter seconded.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 22nd Review draft report to Town Meeting

Documents Distributed:

Agenda, 1 page

Spreadsheet "CPAC FY17 Project Requests 3/7/2016, 1 page

Respectfully submitted by Pari Riahi, Acting Clerk

Approved _____